REMARKS

Claims 2 – 27 are pending and rejected.

The applicant's attorney amends claims 10, 24, 25, 26 and 27. The applicant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claims 2 – 27 and asserts that these claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed below.

Rejection of claims 2 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The applicant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 10 in view of U.S. Patent 2,265,329 issued to Wachs (Wachs) and U.S. Application Publication 2003/0014824 issued to Farmer (Farmer). The applicant's attorney has amended claim 10 and further asserts that Wachs and Farmer do not support a rejection of claim 10, as amended, because each fails to disclose a scrubbing texture that includes longitudinal bands of material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion.

Claim 10 recites a pet washing glove having a scrubbing texture that includes longitudinal bands of material running along the length of a thumb and finger portions, and across a palm portion.

For example, as shown in FIG. 1 and discussed in paragraph 17 of the specification, the glove 10 has a flexible first side 20. The first side 20 includes a first scrubbing texture 52 having longitudinal bands 52a – 52d of material running along the length of a thumb and finger portions, and across a palm portion.

not disclose a scrubbing texture associated with the wall portion 12 that includes longitudinal bands of material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion. Therefore, unlike the applicants' glove in claim 10, Wachs' bath mitt does not include longitudinal bands of scrubbing material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion.

Similarly, Farmer fails to disclose a scrubbing texture that includes longitudinal bands of material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion. Farmer discloses a bathing device 10 (FIGS. 1 – 3) in the shape of a mitten (FIG. 5). The mitten includes a first layer 20 having minute cloth clusters 22 located all over the layer 20, and a second layer 30 having netting material 32 also located all over the layer 30. The first layer 20 does not include longitudinal bands of the cloth clusters 22 that run along the length of the thumb, finger and palm portions. The second layer 30 does not include longitudinal bands of netting material 32 that run along the length of the thumb, finger and palm portions. Therefore, unlike the applicants' glove in claim 10, as amended, Farmer's mitten does not include longitudinal bands of scrubbing material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion.

Claims 2-9 and 11-23 are patentable by virtue of their dependencies on claim 10.

Rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The applicant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 24 in view of Wachs, Farmer and U.S. Application Publication 2003/0097725 issued to Smith (Smith). The applicant's attorney has amended claim 24 and further asserts that Wachs, Farmer and Smith do not support a rejection of claim 24, as amended, for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 10 over Wachs and Farmer.

Similar to Wachs and Farmer, Smith fails to disclose a scrubbing texture that includes longitudinal bands of material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion. Smith discloses a cleaning cloth 10 (FIG. 1)

having upper and lower layers or cover sheets 12. The cloth is not in the shape of a glove and does not include a cavity that one's hand may be inserted into. Thus, the cloth 10 does not include thumb, finger and palm portions. Therefore, unlike the applicants' glove in claim 24, as amended, Smith's cleaning cloth 10 does not include longitudinal bands of scrubbing material running along the length of the thumb and finger portions, and across the palm portion.

Rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 is allowable over Wachs, Farmer and Smith for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 24 over Wachs, Farmer and Smith.

Rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 26 is allowable over Wachs, Farmer and Smith for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 24 over Wachs, Farmer and Smith.

Rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 27 is allowable over Wachs, Farmer and Smith for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 24 over Wachs, Farmer and Smith.

Conclusion

Applicant's attorney respectfully requests the examiner withdraw her rejection of claims 2 – 27 in view of applicant's amendments and remarks and issue an allowance for these claims.

Should any additional fees be required, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

If the examiner believes that a phone interview would be helpful, she is respectfully requested to contact the applicant's attorney, John Janeway, at (425) 455-5575.

DATED this 16th day of February, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

John M. Janeway

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 45/796

155 108th Avenue N.E., Ste. 350

Bellevue, WA 98004-5973

P: (425) 455-5575 F: (425) 455-1046

E-mail: jjaneway@graybeal.com

Enclosures: Return Receipt postcard